

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

ANTHONY WALTERS

Plaintiff,

Case No. 07 C 6291

VS.

JUDGE COAR

Chicago Police Officers C. Bratek, Star No. 8077,
and T. Martin, Star No. 12928,
Individually,

Defendants,

REPORT OF PARTIES' PLANNING CONFERENCE

Pursuant to this Court's order Garrett Browne representing plaintiff and Anne Preston representing defendants met via telephone on February 19, 2008 pursuant to Rule 26(f) to discuss:

(1) The nature and basis of claims and defenses: Plaintiff alleges, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1983 that the defendants violated his civil rights. Specifically plaintiff contends that the defendant arrested him without probable cause and then violated his due process rights during the ensuing criminal prosecution. Defendants deny plaintiff's allegations and deny that they violated his civil rights.

(2) On February 20, 2008, plaintiff provided defendants with a written settlement proposal.

Defendants have not had an opportunity to evaluate plaintiff's settlement proposal.

However, defendants are willing to discuss the possibility of reaching a settlement in this matter.

(3) Defendants have already made their Rule 26(a)(1) disclosures. Plaintiff will make his Rule 26(a)(1) disclosures by February 21, 2008.

(4) Discovery Plan:

A. The parties do not believe the case can be simplified by taking any specific steps.

- B. The parties do not believe any modifications to the discovery requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Local Rules are necessary.
- C. Discovery will be needed on the following subjects:
 - 1. The factual circumstances surrounding plaintiff's arrest and prosecution
 - 2. The extent and nature of any injuries claimed by plaintiff.
 - 3. The factual basis of defenses asserted by defendants.
- D. Discovery should not be conducted in phases.
- E. Discovery is not likely to be contentious and the parties are not requesting that this matter be referred to the Magistrate Judge for oversight.
- F. The parties do not consent to this matter being referred to the Magistrate Judge for final disposition.
- G. The parties do not believe alternative dispute resolution will useful in this case.
- H. The plaintiff has made a written settlement demand of \$40,000. The defendants have not yet had an opportunity to formulate a settlement offer.
- I. The parties do not recommend that the Court take any specific steps that would expedite the resolution of this matter.

s/Garrett Browne
Attorney for Plaintiff
ED FOX & ASSOCIATES
300 West Adams, Suite 330
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 345-8877
gbrowne@efox-law.com

s/Anne Preston
Attorney for Defendants
Asst. Corp. Counsel
30 N. LaSalle St., Suite 1400
Chicago, IL. 60602
(312) 742-4045

Any dispositive motions to be filed on or before **August 21, 2008**.

3. Final Pretrial Order and Conference

The final pretrial order shall be filed on or before **November 21, 2008**.

The final pretrial conference will be held on _____ at _____

4. Trial

Trial in this matter is on _____ at 10:00 a.m.

5. Status Hearings

A further status hearing/preliminary pretrial conference should be held on **July 22, 2008**.

s/Garrett Browne
Attorney for Plaintiff
ED FOX & ASSOCIATES
300 West Adams, Suite 330
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 345-8877
gbrowne@efox-law.com

s/Anne Preston
Attorney for Defendants
Asst. Corp. Counsel
30 N. LaSalle St., Suite 1400
Chicago, IL. 60602
(312) 742-4045